FILED

JUN 3 0 2008

Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOUKO M. HILSKA,)		
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No.	08 1123
v.)		
WILLIAM K. SUTER, et al.,)		
Defendants.)		

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* complaint. The Court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff brings this action against the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, a

Supreme Court Case Analyst, and a former United States Attorney General. He alleges that the

Supreme Court Clerk and Case Analyst failed to send him copies of the decision rendered in his

case. See Compl. at 2 (page numbers designated by the Court). According to plaintiff, he has

"asked US Attorney General for granting a dissolution of the immunity for [defendants Suter and

Higgins] in their acts taken of the judicial operations of the Court in any matter." Id.

As the Court concluded in plaintiff's prior case, see Hilska v. Suter, No. 06-2192 (UNA) (D.D.C. Dec. 26, 2006), aff'd, No. 07-5016 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 9, 2007) (per curiam), this Court has no authority to determine what action, if any, must be taken by the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court's administrative officers. See In re Marin, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 844 (1992). It is well settled that judges and other court officials have absolute immunity for their actions taken in a judicial or quasi-judicial capacity. See Stump v.

Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356 (1978); Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (per curiam). The Attorney General alone is without authority to overturn such Supreme Court precedent.

The Court will dismiss this action for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion will be issued separately on this same date.

United States District Judge

DATE: 6)1905